

Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template

Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41770 and 41822, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 require that each countywide or regional agency integrated waste management plan (CIWMP/RAIWMP), and the elements thereof, be reviewed, revised, if necessary, and submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) every five years. This Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template was developed in an effort to provide a cost-effective method to streamline the Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP review and reporting process. The purpose of this Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template is to document compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and to request Board approval of the Five-CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report findings.

After reviewing and considering the Local Task Force (LTF) comments submitted to the county or regional agency and the Board on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP that need revision, if any, the county or regional agency may use this template for its Five-CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report. The Five-County or Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Review Report Guidelines describe each section of this template and provide general guidelines with respect to preparing the report. Completed and signed reports should be submitted to the Office of Local Assistance (OLA) at the address below. Please know that upon submittal, OLA staff may request additional information if the details provided in this form are not clear or are not complete. Within 90 days of receiving a *complete* Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report, OLA staff will review the request and prepare an agenda item with their findings for Board consideration.

If you have any questions about the Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review process or how to complete this form, please contact your OLA representative at (916) 341-6199. Mail completed and signed Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Reports to:

California Integrated Waste Management Board
Office of Local Assistance, MS-25
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

Form can be unlocked and modified (e.g., adding rows to tables) by clicking on the "Protect Form" icon in the forms tool bar. If you have any questions, please contact your OLA representative at (916) 341-6199.



General Instructions

Please complete Sections 1 through 9, and then all other applicable subsections.

SECTION 1.0 COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION			
I certify that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to complete this report and request approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Five-Review Report on behalf of:			
County or Regional Agency Name City and County of San Francisco		County San Francisco	
Authorized Signature 		Title Director, SF Environment	
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Jared Blumenfeld	Date 2/28/05	Phone (415) 355-3701	
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Robert Haley	Title Recycling Program Manager	Phone (415) 355-3752	
Mailing Address 11 Grove Street	City San Francisco	State CA	Zip 94102
E-mail Address robert.haley@sfgov.org			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0	COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION	1
2.0	BACKGROUND	3
3.0	LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW	4
4.0	TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES	5
4.1	Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency	
4.2	Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency	
4.3	Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Siting Element and Summary Plan	
4.4	Changes in Administrative Responsibilities	
4.5	Programs that were Scheduled to be Implemented but were not	
4.6	Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials	
4.7	Changes in the Implementation Schedule	
5.0	ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW	14
6.0	OTHER ISSUES	14
7.0	SUMMARY of FINDINGS	15
8.0	REVISION SCHEDULE	15
9.0	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	15

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is the county's first Five-Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP.

The jurisdictions in the county include the City and County of San Francisco.

- ☐ Each jurisdiction in the county has a diversion requirement of 50% for 2000 and each year thereafter. No petition for a reduction in to the 50% requirement or time extension has been requested by any of the jurisdictions.
- ☒ One or more of the jurisdictions in the county has an alternative diversion requirement or time extension. The details are provided in the table below.

Jurisdiction	Type of Alternative Diversion Requirement	Diversion Requirement (%)	Goal/Extension Date
San Francisco	Time Extension	50%	2001-2003
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		

Additional Information (e.g., recent regional agency formation, newly incorporated city, etc.)

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

1. The Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:
☐ Please see Attachment for additional information.

Name	Representative Of (e.g., City or County)

2. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP or RAIWMP and finalized its comments:
☐ At the LTF meeting. ☒ Other (Explain): San Francisco is statutorily exempt from forming a Local Task Force.
3. The county received the written comments from the LTF on , beginning the 45-day period for submitting the Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report to the Board and the LTF.
4. A copy of the LTF comments:
☐ is included as Appendix .
☐ was submitted to the Board on .
5. In summary, the LTF comments conclude that

**SECTION 4.0 TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3)
(A) THROUGH (H)**

The subsections below address not only the areas of change specified in the regulations, but also provide specific analysis regarding the continued adequacy the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination as to whether each necessitates a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

The following tables document the demographic changes in the county since 1990. The analysis addresses the adequacy of the planning documents in light of these changes and the need, if any, for revision.

- ☒ The residential/non-residential generation percentages have not changed significantly since the preparation of the planning documents.
- ☐ The residential/non-residential generation percentages have changed significantly since the preparation of the original planning documents. The following table documents the new percentages and the data source (i.e., corresponding Board-approved new generation study).

Table 1. Sources of Generation

JURISDICTION	RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE		NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE	
	OLD	NEW	OLD	NEW
City of				
City of				
City of				
City of				
Unincorporated Area				

Sources (e.g., Board-approved new or corrected 1999 generation study):

Table 2. Demographics*

POPULATION			
Population For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2003	% Change
City of Population			
City of Population			
City of Population			
City of Population			
Unincorporated Population			
Countywide Population	723,959	789,700	+9%

EMPLOYMENT			
Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2003	% Change
Countywide Employment	389,900	375,600	-4%

TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS			
Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2003	% Change
City of Taxable Sales			
City of Taxable Sales			
City of Taxable Sales			
City of Taxable Sales			
Unincorporated County Taxable Sales			
Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions	8,596,454,000	11,496,746,000 0	+34%

Consumer Price Index			
Statewide Consumer Price Index	1990	2003	% Change
	132.1	196.4	+49%

*Source: ☐ Board's Default Adjustment Factors

(<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdiFac.asp>) ☒ Other: SF CPI from CIWMB website.

Table 3. Dwelling Information

Jurisdiction	1990 Single Family Dwellings	2003 Single Family Dwellings	% Change	Click Multi- Family Dwellings	2003 Multi- Family Dwellings	% Change	Click Mobile Homes	2003 Mobile Homes	% Change
San Francisco	100,000	100,000	0%	133,000	133,000	0%	0	0	0%

Source: City and Norcal Waste Systems estimates.

Analysis

- ☒ These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.
- ☐ These demographic changes warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically,

While population has increased slightly, employment has decreased slightly. The increase in taxable sales is largely explained by the CPI increase and decrease in employment. Dwellings do not change much because San Francisco is a dense, built-out city.

Section 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

1. Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency (as it relates to diversion program implementation)

The data below document changes in reported disposal compared to original SRRE projections. Additionally, the Biennial Review findings for each jurisdiction are provided in Table 6 below to demonstrate progress in implementing the SRRE and achieving diversion mandates. The analysis at the end of this section addresses how these changes are being addressed (e.g., how existing, new or planned programs deal with the reported changes in the quantities of waste) relative to the jurisdictions' ability to meet and maintain the diversion goal and the need, if any, for a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Disposal

The following table provides disposal data for the county from the Solid Waste Generation Study (1990) and each jurisdiction's Annual Reports (1995 through 2002).

Year	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
City of									
City of									
City of									
City of									
Uni. County									
Countywide	667,00 0	684,02 5	702,59 6	791,13 6	887,07 8	806,69 2	872,73 1	856,11 4	758,74 7

Table 4. Disposal Totals (Tons)

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility* <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin Detail* at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>): DRS. Class II waste not yet approved by CIWMB (e.g., 75,469 tons in 2001 and 56,735 tons in 2002) is not subtracted out above.

Table 5. Comparison of SRRE-2000 Projected Disposal Tonnage vs. 2000 Disposal Totals

The following table is a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the 2000 disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction	SRRE 2003 Projected	Disposal 2003 Reported	% Difference
City of			
City of			
City of			
City of			
Unincorporated County			
Countywide	457,969	625,293	37%

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility* <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin Detail* at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>): DRS (less 93,638 tons of class II waste) and SWGS table 4-12.

Diversion

The Biennial Review findings for the county and associated cities are listed in Table 6 to demonstrate each jurisdiction's progress in implementing its SRRE and achieving the mandated diversion requirements. Additionally, following these data is an explanation of any significant changes in diversion rate trends (e.g., report year tonnage modification, new or corrected Solid Waste Generation Study, newly implemented programs).

Table 6. Biennial Review Data for County Jurisdictions (1997 to 2002)

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Countywide	1997	33%	Board Approved
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
Countywide	1998	40%	Board Approved
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
Countywide	1999	42%	Board Approved
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
Countywide	2000	46%	Board Approved Time Extension
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
Countywide	2001	52%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
Countywide	2002	63%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet NBY
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu
	Click here for drop down	%	Click here for drop down menu

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report* <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp>): CIWMB website and submitted generation-based studies, disposal corrections and biomass credits for 2001 and 2002.

Explanation of Disposal and Diversion Rate Trends (if applicable)

- ☒ These changes in quantities of waste, as they relate the meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals, do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided in the analysis section below.
- ☐ These changes in quantities of waste, as they relate the meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals, warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically,

2. Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

The following addresses whether changes in permitted disposal capacity and waste quantities (both imported from out of county and generated in the county) affect the county's ability to maintain 15 years of disposal capacity and includes a determination regarding the need for planning document revision.

- ☒ The county or regional agency (if it includes the entire county) continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., greater than 15 years). Supporting documentation is provided in Attachment titled "Altamont Projections".

- ☐ The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity. The analysis below provides the strategy for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity. Attached is a revision schedule for the SE.

Analysis

Generation started returning to previous levels after the "dot com" bubble burst around the end of the millenium. After performing five annual generation-based studies, we requested that our base year be changed to 2002 to better reflect diversion that was not captured in 1990. The implementation of the many programs in our SRRE, with the changes above, resulted in a steady diversion increase and exceeding the 50% goal. We are now developing and implementing programs to reach San Francisco's goals of 75% diversion by 2010 and zero waste by 2020. Although accomplishing these goals would eliminate the need for additional landfill capacity, the City is evaluating options for securing more capacity in case our projections are not realized. Requiring 15 years of disposal capacity is ultimately inconsistent with the goal of zero waste.

Section 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Countywide Siting Element (SE) and Summary Plan (SP)

The county has experienced the following changes in the funding of the SE or SP:

- None.

Analysis

- ☒ There have been no changes in funding source administration of the SE and SP or the changes that have occurred do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.
- ☐ These changes in funding source for the administration of the SE and SP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically,

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The county has experienced changes in the following administrative responsibilities:

- The Solid Waste Management Program has been merged into the Department of the Environment.

Analysis

- ☒ These changes in administrative responsibilities do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.
- ☐ These changes in administrative responsibilities warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically,

Section 4.5 Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented But Were Not

1. Progress of Program Implementation

- a. Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)
- ☒ All program implementation information has been updated in the Board's Planning and Reporting Information System (PARIS), including the reason for not implementing specific programs, if applicable. Additionally, the analysis below addresses the progress of the programs that have been implemented.
- ☐ All program implementation information has not yet been updated in PARIS. Attachment lists the SRRE and/or HHWE programs selected for implementation but which have not been implemented, including a statement as to why they were not implemented. Additionally, the analysis below addresses the progress of the programs that have been implemented.
- b. Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE)
- ☒ There have been no changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFE).
- ☐ Attachment lists changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFE).
- c. Countywide Siting Element (SE)
- ☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SE.
- ☐ Attachment lists changes to the information provided in current the SE.
- d. Summary Plan
- ☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SP.
- ☐ Attachment lists changes to the information provided in current the SP.
2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting their Goals
- ☒ The programs are meeting their goals.
- ☐ The programs are not meeting their goals. The discussion that follows in the analysis section below addresses the contingency measures that are being enacted to ensure compliance with PRC Section 41751 (i.e., what specific steps are being taken by local agencies, acting independently and in concert, to achieve the purposes of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989) and whether the listed changes in program implementation necessitate a revision of one or more of the planning documents.

Analysis

- ☒ The aforementioned changes in program implementation do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.

- ☐ Changes in program implementation warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically,

All SRRE programs have been implemented and San Francisco has exceeded 50% diversion.

Section 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

The following discusses any changes in available markets for recyclable materials **including** a determination as to whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP or RAIWMP such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is needed.

San Francisco has worked to maintain and expand markets, and helped develop markets ranging from used electronics to mattresses. Our efforts do not affect the adequacy of our CIWMP.

Section 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule

Below is discussion of changes in the implementation schedule and a determination as to whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP or the RAIWMP such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is necessary.

San Francisco received a Board approved time extension through 2003 and submitted generation-based studies documenting over 50% diversion for 2001 on. The adequacy of the CIWMP was not affected.

SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES

The following addresses any other significant issues/changes in the county and whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP or RAIWMP such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is needed.

None.

SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

- ☒ The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the county have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP or RAIWMP elements. No jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents.
- ☐ The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP or RAIWMP elements. The following jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents, as listed:

The discussion below addresses the county's evaluation of the Annual Report data relating to planning document adequacy and includes determination regarding the need to revise one or more of these documents.

San Francisco, both a City and County, has not documented in its Annual Reports the need to revise one or more of its planning documents.

SECTION 7.0 SUMMARY of FINDINGS by COUNTY

The goals, objectives and policies in San Francisco's elements, as updated, are still applicable and consistent with PRC sections 40051 and 40052. There have not been significant changes that affect countywide solid waste management. Any minor changes have been addressed in Annual Reports, generation-based studies and a Time Extension. Therefore, no revisions to any planning documents are necessary.

SECTION 8.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if any)

SECTION 9.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (if any)

-
-
-

Altamont Projections

Period	Disposal	Capacity Remaining
Through 2003	9,701,795	5,298,205
2004	560,246	4,737,959
2005	525,231	4,212,728
2006	490,215	3,722,513
2007	455,200	3,267,313
2008	420,185	2,847,129
2009	385,169	2,461,960
2010	350,154	2,111,806
2011	315,138	1,796,668
2012	280,123	1,516,545
2013	245,108	1,271,437
2014	210,092	1,061,345
2015	175,077	886,268
2016	140,062	746,206
2017	105,046	641,160
2018	70,031	571,129
2019	35,015	536,114
2020	0	536,114